

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 28 September 2005. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 1, 5, 14, 18, 24, and 28 are now amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims.

It is believed that with such amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5, 18, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner stated that the term “good” is a relative term which renders these Claims indefinite. It is believed that the amendments incorporated hereby into each of the Claims 5, 18, and 28 now obviate the Examiner’s formal concerns under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 8-9, 14-18, and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Wang, et al. reference. The Examiner further rejected Claims 6-7, 9-13, 20-23, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable for various reasons over the same Wang, et al. reference. While acknowledging that Wang, et al. does not specifically disclose certain features, the Examiner reasoned that incorporating such features would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As each of the newly-amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 24 now more clearly recites, Applicants' claimed light source includes among its combination of features "a plurality of LED units arranged on one side face of ... [a] printed circuit board," as well as "at least one control unit disposed outside ... [these] LED units." Each such control unit is "connected in shared manner to LEDs of like color" found respectively "in the ... LED units," and serve to "adaptively control a driving current to each LED connected thereto," as newly-amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 24 each also now more clearly recite.

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending Claims is not disclosed by the cited reference. The Wang, et al. reference is directed to a light source structure packaged so as to minimize the volume occupied. As such, the disclosed embodiment shows a controlling integral circuit packaged as part of the light emitting diode device 3 in which the different colored LED chips 31, 32, 33 are together disposed. This departs from a structure wherein "at least one control unit [is] disposed outside" a plurality of "LED units" respectively containing the LEDs, as newly-amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 24 now clarify. Moreover, the controlling integral circuit chip 34 of Wang, et al. is shown coupled to each of the multi-colored LED chips 31-33, rather than being "connected in shared manner to LEDs of like color" respectively in plural LED units, as Claims 1, 14, and 24 also now more clearly recite.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Wang, et al. reference is distinguishable from the light source as now more clearly recited by Applicants' pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application. The other reference cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection is believed to be further remote from Applicants' claimed light source when patentability considerations are taken properly into account.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jun Y. Lee', with a stylized, cursive script.

Jun Y. Lee
Registration No. 40,262

Dated: 12/28/2005

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586